

REMARKS

The Examiner's Final Office Action of June 29, 2005 has been received and its contents reviewed. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the consideration given to the above-identified application.

By the above actions, claims 1, 6 and 16 have been amended, while claim 2 has been previously cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3-18 are pending for consideration, of which claims 1, 6 and 16 are independent. In view of these actions and the following remarks, reconsideration of this application is now requested.

Referring now to the detailed Office Action, claims 1 and 3-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Yamazaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,246,070 – hereafter Yamazaki), which is of record.

In response to the rejection, and in the interest of expediting the allowance of this application, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 6 and 16, as shown above. More specifically, independent claims 1, 6 and 16 now further recite an additional feature wherein “the other one of the region to become the source region and the region to become the drain region is not covered with the second mask” in order to further clarify the position of the second mask and further distinguish the presently claimed invention from Yamazaki.

Further, Applicants have amended claims 1, 6 and 16 so as to improve the claim language. Applicants respectfully note that the present invention discloses the (second) mask (as supported by 113b in Fig. 1, for example) covering one of a portion of the source region and a portion of the drain region, and the other one of the source region and the drain region is not covered with the (second) mask (as shown in, e.g., Fig. 1). On the other hand, Yamazaki discloses that both of a portion of a source region and a portion of a drain region are covered with a second mask (112). Hence, the presently claimed invention clearly distinguishes over that of Yamazaki.

Consequently, since each and every feature of the present claims is not taught (and is not inherent) in the teachings of Yamazaki, as is required by MPEP Chapter 2131 in order to establish anticipation, the rejection of claims 1 and 3-18, under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as anticipated by Yamazaki is improper.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all the pending rejections.

While the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, should the Examiner find some issue to remain unresolved, or should any new issues arise, which could be eliminated through discussions with Applicant's representative, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order that the further prosecution of this application can thereby be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,



Luan C. Do
Registration No. 38,434

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Suite 900, 401 9th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000